

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Monday the 8th August 1955.

The House met in the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at three of the clock, Mr. Chairman (THE HON. DR. P. V. CHERIAN) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Impounding of cattle straying in public thoroughfares.

* 331 Q.—DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that two children of Sunkuvur street, Triplicane, one Krishnan, aged 3 years and one Kamala, aged 6 years were gored by a pair of stray cattle on or about April 13, 1955;

(b) whether any instructions have been given to the City Police department to go slow in rounding up and impounding cattle straying in public thoroughfares; and

(c) whether the Government now propose to issue any instructions to the Commissioner of Police, Madras, to round up and impound stray cattle more frequently and more effectively than at present?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM (on behalf of the Hon. the Chief Minister):—“(a) The children referred to were not gored by cattle. The fact is that some buffaloes proceeding towards sea-side dashed against them and they fell down sustaining abrasions on their faces.

“(b) No, Sir.

“(c) The Commissioner of Police has issued instructions to round up all stray cattle.”

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—“Sir, is it within the knowledge of the Government that the cattle owners of the City of Madras protested against the action of the police when they impounded the cattle?”

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“It may be, Sir, that certain cattle owners protested against certain action of the police.”

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—“Sir, is it not within the knowledge of every motorist that these straying animals act as unauthorized Brake Inspectors to the considerable deterioration of the cars when sudden brakes are applied?”

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“Yes, Sir, that may be so. In the same way, children too should not be permitted by their parents to play in the open streets.”

[8th August 1955]

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—“ Sir, may I know whether the police authorities have issued any public notice as to the precautions to be taken by cattle owners and will the Government take the public and also the affected parties with them in such matters and try by propaganda and persuasion to get things done in order before launching any sudden drive of the kind contemplated in this question? ”

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“ Sir, the Commissioner of Police has reported that the owners of cattle in Sunkuvar street and other streets of Triplicane have all been warned against letting loose their cattle.”

SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR :—“ Sir, is not cattle trespass a growing nuisance in the City? ”

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“ It is no doubt a nuisance as there are other nuisances in the City.”

SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR :—“ Sir, I say that it is a growing nuisance as it is difficult for cars to be driven in open streets.”

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“ I do not think, Sir, it can be a growing nuisance. I do not see any growth of population of the cattle.”

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—“ Sir, does not the Hon. Minister think that children playing in the open streets are equivalent to straying cattle? ” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“ Sir, there is no question of comparing one with the other. I want the parents also to see that their children are not let loose in the streets and get themselves exposed to accidents.”

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—“ Sir, have the Government any serious objection for banning cattle from the City of Madras? ”

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“ Certainly, the Government cannot do that now.”

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN :—“ Sir, is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that there are thousands of families in Madras who have no houses to live in and naturally their children are always on the roadside? ” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—“ If the parents have no houses to live in and live in the open streets, let them have the children also along with them. They should not let loose their children in the streets.”

8th August 1955]

Government Order regarding pay of untrained graduates in secondary schools.

* 332 Q.—SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance and Education be pleased to state with reference to the answer to supplementary question to Legislative Council starred Question No. 137 answered on 13th August 1954 the date of the Government Order allowing a salary of Rs. 65 per mensem for graduates with oriental language as the special subject appointed as Pandits in local board secondary schools?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“The salary of Rs. 65 is allowed from 1st July 1954.”

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY:—“Sir, may I know whether this salary will be made applicable to Tamil graduates who served in the district board schools prior to 1st July 1954, that is, in the school year 1953–54?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“Sir, the question came up with reference to the employment of an Honours graduate in Tamil in the District Board School, Chingleput, and we have passed orders stating that these persons should be taken as untrained graduates in secondary schools. We have passed orders that they should be paid a salary of Rs. 65 from 1st July 1954 and the relevant Government Order is No. 954, Education, dated 8th July 1954.”

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY:—“Sir, as there is a case of a Tamil graduate who served under the Tirunelveli District Board in 1953–54 and left for training later, will the Government see that the action of the district board in paying the Tamil graduate only Rs. 45 instead of Rs. 65 being the salary for a raw graduate is wrong and that he be paid Rs. 65?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“Sir, we do not want to give retrospective effect to the order.”

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY:—“Is it not a fact, Sir, that the district board has gone wrong by paying a graduate Rs. 45 for the sake of having taken Tamil instead of English?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“That is why I said that it has been rectified. They are treated as untrained graduates now.”

Revision of scales of pay of non-gazetted Government servants.

* 333 Q.—SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance and Education be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to revise the scales of pay of all non-gazetted Government servants in the Madras State?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“No. There is at present no such proposal under consideration.”

[8th August 1955]

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI :—“கெஜட் பதிவில்லாத சர்க்கார் ஊழியர்களின் சம்பள விகிதத்தை உயர்த்துவதற்கு அடுத்த ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டத்தில் ஏதாவது வகை செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கிறதா?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“கூடிய சீக்கிரத்தில் அடுத்த ஐந்தாண்டுத்திட்டத்தைப் பற்றி இங்கு விவாதம் நடக்கும். அங்கத்தினர்கள் அப்பொழுது முழு விவரமும் தெரிந்துக்கொள்ளலாம்.”

Inclusion of Courtallam in the list of tourist centres.

* 334 Q.—**SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance and Education be pleased to state with reference to the answer to supplementary question to Question No. 155 answered on 21st February 1955—

(a) whether Courtallam has been recommended for inclusion in the list of tourist centres to be developed with the aid of the Government of India; and

(b) if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“(a) Yes, Sir.

“(b) Does not arise.”

Settlement of rights over Palar waters between Madras and Mysore States.

* 335 Q.—**SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state with reference to the answers to the Legislative Council Starred Questions Nos. 274 and 275 answered on 5th April 1955—

(a) whether the Union Government have been addressed in regard to the settlement of the rights over Palar waters between Madras and Mysore States; and if so, when and whether any reply has been received; and

(b) what further steps have been taken for the settlement of this question?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—“(a) The Government of India were addressed on 23rd March 1955 to constitute a Council under Article 263 of the Constitution of India to make enquiries on the question of utilization of the Palar waters and suggest suitable remedies. The Government of India have suggested that the Chief Engineers of the two States may meet and discuss the matter and that the Government of India would depute one of their technical officers to be present at the discussion, if it would be of help.

“(b) This Government have accepted the suggestion of the Government of India and informed them accordingly. The Government of Mysore have also been addressed for fixing a venue and date for the meeting of the Chief Engineers and their reply is awaited.”

8th August 1955]

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—“ Sir, may I know whether the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, has been instructed to take up the matter and to arrange for meeting the Chief Engineer of the Mysore State; and if so, when the investigation of experts would take place? ”

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—“ Yes, Sir. We have addressed the Mysore Government and the latest information is that the Government of Mysore have since replied to us on 3rd August 1955 that the Chief Engineer had been instructed to address the Chief Engineer of this State in the matter for fixing a suitable date and time.”

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—“ May I know, Sir, whether non-officials would be associated with this enquiry regarding Palar waters? ”

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—“ I do not think, Sir, it is possible, because there was a suggestion that some of the M.L.As. of this State and the Hon. the Revenue Minister should meet the corresponding Minister and some of the M.L.As. of the other State, but the Chief Minister of Mysore was not agreeable to this. Ministerial talks may take place after the technical men have given their opinion.”

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—“ Will the Hon. Minister kindly arrange for personal top-level discussion and settlement of this question at ministerial level? ”

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—“ Yes, Sir. That will follow after the technical men, our Engineers, have met and submitted a report to us.”

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message, dated the 6th August 1955, from the Governor of Madras :— 3-10 P.M.

‘ I have received with great satisfaction your resolution of thanks for the Address with which I opened the present Session of the Legislature.’ ”

III.—MESSAGE FROM THE ASSEMBLY.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I have to announce to the House that I have received the following messages, dated the 8th August 1955 from the Hon. the Speaker, Madras Legislative Assembly :—

‘ (1) In accordance with rule 114 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I transmit a copy of the Madras City Police and Gaming

[Mr. Chairman]

[8th August 1955]

(Amendment) Bill, 1955 (L.A. Bill No. 13 of 1955), as passed by the Assembly on the 8th August 1955 and signed by me for the concurrence of the Council; and

(2) In accordance with Rule 114 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I transmit a copy of the Police (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1955 (L.A. Bill No. 14 of 1955) as passed by the Assembly on the 8th August 1955 and signed by me for the concurrence of the Council.' "

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS CULTIVATING TENANTS PROTECTION BILL, 1955
(L.A. BILL NO. 11 OF 1955).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' That this House concurs with the Assembly in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses consisting of 30 Members (20 Members of the Assembly and 10 Members of the Council) to consider the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Bill, 1955 (L.A. Bill No. 11 of 1955), and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee :—

The Hon. Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam.

Sri K. Bhashyam.

Sri A. M. Allapichai.

Sri T. Purushotham.

Sri T. G. Krishnamoorthi.

Sri N. Nallasenapathi Sarkarai Manradia.

Dr. V. K. John.

Sri Mohamed Raza Khan.

Sri A. Gajapathy Nayagar.

Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar.' "

MR. CHAIRMAN :—Motion moved—

' That this House concurs with the Assembly in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses consisting of 30 Members (20 Members of the Assembly and 10 Members of the Council) to consider the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Bill, 1955 (L.A. Bill No. 11 of 1955), and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee :—

The Hon. Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam.

Sri K. Bhashyam.

Sri A. M. Allapichai.

Sri T. Purushotham.

Sri T. G. Krishnamoorthi.

8th August 1955]

[Mr. Chairman]

Sri N. Nallasenapathi Sarkarai Manradiator.

Dr. V. K. John.

Sri Mohamed Raza Khan.

Sri A. Gajapathy Nayagar.

Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar.' "

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR :—“ Sir, this Bill is for a period of one year. It is in the nature of a verdict that this Government are satisfied that the responsibility for the unjust eviction is that of the landlords. The Government must place before the Council and the Assembly sufficient facts to show that there have been unjust evictions. Hon. Members are aware of the fact that we waited in deputation on the Revenue Minister. Some Members from the Tiruchirappalli district made a representation that the authorities there listened to only representations made on behalf of the tenants, and that they did not pay due regard to the representations made by the mirasdars. They even wanted that, without the help of the authorities, they should be allowed to settle these matters with the tenants. That is what I found from the newspaper reports. I am glad to say that the Revenue Minister said that he would make enquiries. I think it is better to proceed not on the footing that all evictions are unjust, but to apportion the blame among the parties. If evictions have not been unjust, and if they are due to reasons like wilful trespass on the land, carrying away of the crops, etc., these also should be taken into consideration. Such things very often happen. Will it be in the best interests of agriculture to restore these very tenants who have been giving trouble? It is part of a technique now to carry on tenant agitation and create trouble so that the Government of the day may be urged to bring forward a Tenancy Bill. In the Tenancy Bill (fortunately there is no such provision in this Bill), they (the tenants) ask for more rights, a greater share of the produce, and so on. But there is nothing of the kind in this Bill. Still we find that there are some who are always thinking in favour of the tenants and who have got certain set ideologies. They put forward the view that the share of the tenant should be increased, that the rent court should be enabled to see that they get higher rents, that because prices have gone up, they should also get a higher rate of the produce, etc.

“ It is well to remember that tenants are also sometimes land owners in some of these districts. I think the Leader of the House referred to this fact. There are tenants who are owners of lands in some portion and tenants in other portions. All these tenants are not merely cultivating tenants. These factors have to be taken into consideration. It is better that an enquiry is made to find out whether there has been any unjust eviction. Only after that enquiry it must be determined whether this provision should be applied to all districts. In the Tanjore Tenants and Pannayals Protection Act, there is a provision that the Government may extend the provisions of that Act to other places. Here also there

[Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar] [8th August 1955]

is a similar provision. We must take into consideration the fact that in some portions in Tanjore district itself that Act does not apply. Similarly a provision should be made here that this Act will not apply to all places but should apply to portions in which the Government feel satisfied that this Act should be applied. Afterwards, the Government can extend the Act to all places if they like. Only to places where the Government are satisfied that there had been unjust evictions, this Act should be applied. It should proceed on the footing that only in some places there have been unjust evictions. It is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, 'It has been brought to the notice of Government that in anticipation of land reforms legislation, owners of lands are evicting cultivating tenants'. There are cases in which the tenants have been creating trouble in anticipation of land reforms legislation. These two things must be therefore considered. My submission is that there should be a just legislation. I am saying that the Government should not take sides. Let them make an impartial enquiry, and then apply the provisions of this Bill properly. It is with that view alone that this Bill should be passed, because this measure is only for one year. When we are restoring the tenant to his original position, we must see how far he has been justified in trespassing upon the property and carrying away the crop, etc. Our target in the Second Five-Year Plan, so far as our proposals are concerned, is 6 lakhs tons of more food-grains. Let us not do anything to reduce that target. To see that the target is not reduced, we must see that there is peace in the agricultural sector so that both the land owner and the tenant get on amicably. After all it must be remembered that in the ryotwari area, the ryot also is a cultivating man. There are small owners of land and they are as much cultivating people with their own labour or hired labour as the cultivating tenants contemplated by the Bill. That is my point. If merely the word tenant is mentioned, immediately he becomes the favoured boy of the Government. I cannot understand this. There are persons who pay a revenue of only Rs. 10 and still they are owners of land and also cultivating tenants, cultivating their lands with hired labour or casual labour. In our State conditions are peculiar. The tenancy legislation that applies to landlord and tenant in other States should not be applied entirely to our State. The ryotwari system in our State has worked democratically than in any other portion of our Indian Union. Therefore it is that there are small landlords cultivating 3 acres, 4 acres and 5 acres. I am glad that at this time, when we are raising this question, our very distinguished and hon. Colleague, Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar is here. He knows fully that what I am saying is not entirely untrue or exaggerated. The word 'ryot' is not at all used here though under the ryotwari system of land tenure which is obtaining in our country all are called ryots but we use the words 'landholder' and 'landowner' so that they may smack of rack-renters and erstwhile zamindars who have been liquidated. The common law of our country describes them only as ryots. Some people have left off

3-20
P.m.

8th August 1955] [Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar]

their lands and some others have slowly acquired them and become big. Otherwise, they would still remain small landowners. If we take the old system of distribution of land which took place some hundred years ago, you will find that all of them were very small landowners and they became bigger owners only gradually. If the Government want land legislation here which is going to help the tenants in this particular manner they should also see that the present land revenue system is changed. The existing land revenue system was based on the principle that the man who paid the revenue was the ryot. Now we must take the entire holding into consideration and let us not merely talk about eviction here or eviction there or by whom or for what reasons. Our ryotwari system is something peculiar to this part of the country, and let us not introduce here something which is practised in other parts of the world. I am not going to speak on the various provisions of the Bill because it is being referred to a Select Committee. I am only speaking of the general approach that should be made to a matter like this."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a very strong feeling that this Bill is introduced for the purpose of shelving the solution of the land problem for one year and thereafter for several years, because the Government can introduce another Bill next year to extend the life of this measure by one or two years, as they have been doing in many matters. It is stated in the Objects of Reasons :

" It has been brought to the notice of Government that in anticipation of land reforms legislation, owners of lands are evicting cultivating tenants with a view to bringing the lands under their personal cultivation. Such large-scale eviction will, if allowed to continue, lead to agrarian trouble and disturbance and to breach of peace. The object of this Bill is to protect the tenants from unjust eviction for a period of one year."

The Hon. the Minister who moved this Bill could not take this House into confidence and say how many cases there have been during the one year this question of land reform has been under discussion. Sir, you know that the tenant cannot be evicted by force. The law of this country does not allow it. The owner must go to a court of law and file a suit. How many suits have been filed during the last one year? We are kept in the dark on this question. A general statement is made that large-scale evictions take place. If the object of this Government is to ensure security of tenure and to prevent eviction of tenants, they could very easily extend the provisions of the Tanjore Tenants and Panniyals Protection Act, 1952, to other areas. The Minister does not tell us why he is not having recourse to this Act. Of course Malabar and South Kanara are already treated separately. We are not now told why this Tanjore Act cannot be extended to other areas if there is large-scale eviction there. Therefore I say this Bill is brought in only to put off the question of land reform which is giving this Government great headache. This Government is pulled on one side by the landowners and rich men and on the other by the poor people and the tenants. They do not know what they could do

[Dr. V. K. John]

[8th August 1955]

and what they should do. I ask the Government to follow certain principles followed in other parts of the world in matters of land reform. The first principle is that there should be no exploitation or expropriation. If you take away the land from the landowner, give him the market value of the land. If necessary, give him a bond which can bear interests. Let the value be paid in instalments and let the bond be even saleable in the market at any time. That is what Germany did. The owner of the soil pays the market value of the land given to him in instalments. The erstwhile landholder gets a bond secured against the land which is guaranteed by a co-operative society or a local body or by the Government. The landowner does not lose anything. He gets the market price and also a fair return of interest out of the bond. Perhaps he may get a premium also if he sells it. So the first principle is nobody should be expropriated. Nobody should be exploited either. The tenants should not be asked to give a capitalised value of the land beyond capitalising the fair rent. You should not capitalise rack rent. If you do, then you will only be exploiting the tenants. The accepted object of any land reform is to get the largest output from the land and to that there must be as wide a distribution of land as feasible economically. It is not by fixing ceiling that you can achieve this object. Any landless person must be given land if he wants to cultivate it and if he is prepared to pay the market value thereof, even in instalments.

“ Sir, we must always remember that agriculture is a human problem and it has been accepted in all civilized countries of the world that the continued prevention of the relationship between the landlord and the tenant is an economic waste. What we should do is to make the cultivating ryot who takes up the land pay the market value for it in instalments over a long period of years, if need be, and pay the value of the land to the person from whom the land is taken away by means of a bond guaranteed by the Government. There is an Act in England called the Small Holdings Act, 1926, under which any person can ask a local body for a few acres of land and it is the duty of that body to acquire and give to that person the land provided he pays sixty years' fair rent. That means the rent as well as the amount that is reserved for the value of the land will be collected from the tenant. In 60 years, the whole amount is paid or much earlier if the tenant so likes. Therefore the principle to be borne in mind in any land reform is that you should not perpetuate the relationship between the landlord and tenant. It is an economic waste to do so. The right thing to do would be to allow the tenant to pay the market value of the land in instalments so that by paying the whole market value of the land, he would become the owner of the land. I do not think of any country in the world wherein the tenant is allowed to expropriate the landlord. The land problem has been solved in Western countries by making the tenant pay the market value of the land in 30 or 40 years time and become the owner of the land after he has paid the full market value. Then only there

3.30
p.m.

8th August 1955]

[Dr. V. K. John]

will be the incentive for the tenant to cultivate the land in the best manner possible and thus pay the market value of the land much earlier, so that he could become the owner of the land much earlier. After the land reforms in Germany in the last century where the tenant was made as the owner of the land after he had paid in instalments the market value of the land, production not only doubled but trebled. Forty-eight and a half years was the time given within which the tenants were asked to pay the market value of the land. But 99 per cent of the tenants paid the amount in 10 years' time because agriculture is a human profession. When the hope of their becoming the owners of the land is there for the tenants, naturally they put all their endeavour in increasing production and thereby pay the market value of the land much earlier. Such an incentive should be given to the tenants. But what do we find here? Nothing of that sort. You want to perpetuate the relationship between the landlord and tenant. Why should not you be bold enough to bring in a legislation wherein you will not perpetuate the relationship between the landlord and tenant, wherein you will not exploit the landlords and wherein you will say in clear terms that the tenant shall become the owner of the land after he has paid the market value of the land within a stipulated number of years. That ought to be the correct approach. Give the necessary assistance to the tenant for cultivation through co-operative agencies and make bold to say that the tenant shall become the owner of the land after he has paid the market value of the land, within such and such a number of years, by instalments. Then only there will be the incentive for the cultivating tenants to produce more. But you never look at this problem fully. You never apply the fundamental principle of land reform and now you have brought forward this measure for one year. This legislation has been brought forward for only one year because the next general elections is approaching and for one year the Government could remain acquiesced. They could say that they have stopped eviction of tenants for one year. Is the problem of land reform concerned only with the tenants? Does it not concern the landless? In fact it is a bigger problem. Eviction of cultivating tenants alone will not solve the problem. That is why it is a rule, in my opinion, to put off this problem which agitates the public mind. That only shows that the Government want to pull on till the next election, without bringing forward any comprehensive legislation for solving the land problem. That is a very wrong thing, wrong in principle to put off this question, especially when we have the Tanjore Tenants and Pannayal Protection Act. Government could have extended that Act to other parts of the State, barring Malabar and South Kanara which have a different kind of land tenure system and for which we have already passed separate legislation. I do not know why the period of one year has been fixed? After all evictions could not take place in one year. Cases do not get finished in the Courts within one year. If the eviction of cultivating tenants is the only thing that is agitating the Government, then this legislation for the stopping of

[Dr. V. K. John]

[8th August 1955]

eviction of tenants for one year is not necessary. Within one year, evictions could not take place. The courts do not finish the cases within one year. They will drag on for some more time. Therefore Government could have as well brought forward a comprehensive legislation for a solution of our land problems, if they really wanted to do so. But they do not want to bring in comprehensive legislation. They want to put it off. To acquiesce the tenants, they have brought forward this measure for one year. I say here and now, that again next year, the Government would come forward for extending the present Act. I will read the words that I have spoken now, when next year the Government would come forward for extending this Act for one more year. I am sure they would do so because they simply want to put off the question of land reform. For three years Government have been saying that they would bring forward comprehensive land reform legislation. Even when the Malabar Tenancy Act was passed, I said that that was not a correct solution of the problem but that the Government should bring in legislation by which the cultivating tenant would become the owner of the land. But they said at that time, they would bring forward shortly comprehensive land reforms. Years and years have gone since then but no comprehensive land reforms have been ushered in. I am not able to understand the reason for Government bringing in this measure, when they could have extended the provisions of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannayal Protection Act to other parts of the State. That would have been very easy. But the real point is, Government do not want to bring in comprehensive land reforms. They have now brought this Bill for one year. Again it will be extended for another year or for two years. They will go on extending till people would have forgotten the matter but if unfortunately some people do not forget it and still agitate for it, I am sure some brain wave of Government would devise some measure to shelve that problem. Have not other States solved this land problem? Bombay has solved it. Why should this State lag behind? Can't they find a rational and scientific solution for solving this question of land reform? It is now said that certain constitutional difficulties stand in the way of Government bringing in legislation putting a ceiling on land holdings and so on. I ask, are you going to wait for the Constitution to be amended according to your liking. Are you going to wait till then for bringing in comprehensive land reforms? Has not Bombay solved the problem without waiting for the Constitution to be amended? You want to expropriate the landlord. You are afraid of the landlords. Why are you afraid of the landlords? If the Government really want to solve the problem, they must distribute the lands to the landless and provide them with the means of cultivation by means of co-operative agencies. Why should Government try to put a ceiling on holdings? If there is a landlord possessing 100 acres, why should they think of depriving him of the land. Unless he has the means, one cannot cultivate the land. Have you got enough means to give the required help to the tenants towards cultivation expenses through co-operative

8th August 1955]

[Dr. V. K. John]

agencies? Have you got the required number of co-operative agencies to advance that necessary help?

“Therefore the Government should recognize the fundamental principle that in any question of land reform, they must proceed on the basis that the tenant shall become the owner of the land after he has paid the market value of the land, within a stipulated period of years, by means of instalments. But the Government do not want to proceed on that basis. They want to expropriate the owners. They have been supported in this inside the Assembly, Council and outside by landed proprietors, whom the Government do not want to frighten. They want to shelve the problem. I protest very strongly against this sort of Government trying to shelve the most important question of land reforms.”

SRI O. P. RAMASWAMI REDDIAR :—“கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நம் மாகாணத்தின் நிலவரி சரித்திரத்தைப் பார்த்தால் மற்ற மாகாணங்களுக்கும் நம் மாகாணத்திற்கும் உள்ள வித்தியாசம் காணப்படும். ஏனென்றால், மற்ற மாகாணங்களிலே பெரிய பெரிய நிலச்சுவாந்தார்கள் இருந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால், நமது மாகாணத்தில் அம்மாதிரி நிலச்சுவாந்தார்கள் இல்லை. இங்கு மங்கும் சிலர் இருந்தார்கள். அவர்களுடைய நிலங்களையும் நாம் முன்னமேயே ஜமீன் ஒழிப்புச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக எடுத்துக்கொண்டோம். இப்பொழுது இருப்பதைப் பார்த்தால் அநேகமாக எவ்வளவு விவசாயிகள் பட்டாதார்களாக இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களிடத்திலே எந்தெந்த முறையில் எவ்வளவு நிலங்கள் இருக்கின்றன, நஞ்சை நிலங்கள் எவ்வளவு, புஞ்சை நிலங்கள் எவ்வளவு, அதில் எவ்வளவு வருவாய் வரும், குடும்பத்தை நடத்துவதற்கு குறைந்த பட்சம் எவ்வளவு வேண்டும், அதற்குத் தகுந்த முறையில் தகுந்த சட்டத்தை நாம் செய்ய வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. இல்லாவிட்டால், ரொம்ப ஏழைகளாக இருக்கும் விவசாயிகள் நாம் வாழ்க்கை நிலையில் உயர்த்தவேண்டும் என்று பிரயத்தனம் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கும்போது, அவர்களுடைய ஏழ்மையை இன்னும் அதிகப்படுத்துவதாகத் தான் இருக்கும். ஏழை விவசாயிகளுடைய வாழ்க்கையை உயர்த்த வேண்டுமென்ற நல்ல எண்ணத்துடன் நாம் காரியங்களைச் செய்ய ஆரம்பித்தாலுங்கூட, நாம் செய்யும் காரியங்களின் மூலமாக பலன் நேர் மாறாக நடந்துகொண்டு வருகிறது என்பதை நாம் கவனித்தால் தெரியும்.

“கடன் நிவாரணச் சட்டத்தை நிறைவேற்றினோம். அந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக நாட்டிலே என்னவாயிற்று? விவசாயிகளுக்கு லேவாதேவி கிடைப்பதில்லை என்ற நிலைக்கு வந்துவிட்டது. விவசாயி ஒரு நிலத்தைப் பயிரிடவேண்டுமென்றால் அதற்கு விதை வேண்டும், உரம் வேண்டும், விவசாயச் செலவுகளுக்கு வேண்டிய பணம் வேண்டும். அரசாங்கத்தின் மூலமாக, கூட்டுறவு இலாகாவின் மூலமாக எவ்வளவு அவர்களுக்குப் பணம் வசதி செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறோம் என்று பார்த்தால் நமது ராஜ்யத்திலேயே ஐந்து கோடி ரூபாய் தான் கூட்டுறவு இலாகாவில் மூலமாக நாம் கொடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறோம். ஆனால், குறிப்பாக இந்த ராஜ்யத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் 300 கோடி ரூபாய் வருஷா வருஷம் சாகுபடி செலவுகளுக்கு மாத்திரம் வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அதில் எவ்வளவு பேர் பிறரை எதிர்பார்க்காமல் விவசாயத்தைச் செய்வதற்குத் தகுந்த முறையில் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்று பார்த்தால் 100-க்கு 90 பேர்கள் கூட அந்த நிலையில் இல்லை. ஆகையால், அதற்குத் தகுந்த வசதியும் செய்ய வேண்டும். அந்த வசதியைச் செய்து கொடுத்து, மற்ற துறைகளிலும் முன்னேற்றம் அடைவதற்கும் பொருளாதார நிலையிலே முன்னேற்றம் அடைய முடியும் என்பதற்கும் நாம் எல்லோரும் யோசித்து, தகுந்த முறையிலே சட்டங்கள் செய்ய வேண்டும். விவசாயிகள் இப்பொழுது இருக்கிற நிலையில் இன்னும் கொஞ்சம் செளகரியம் கொடுப்பதற்கு நாம்

3-40
p.m.

[Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar]

[8th August 1955]

பிரயத்தனம் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்ற எண்ணத்தில் செய்தாலும், நேர் மாறான பலனைத்தான் அடைய முடியும் என்பதை என்னுடைய அனுபவத்திலிருந்து தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.”

DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ I suggest that co-operative societies may be developed.”

SRI O. P. RAMASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ எந்த முறையில் நீங்கள் செய்தாலும் சரி அதைப் பற்றி நான் ஒன்றும் சொல்லவில்லை. பெரும்பான்மையான ஜனங்களுக்கு எந்தெந்த துறையிலே நாம் அரசாங்கமோ சமூகமோ மத்திய சர்க்காரோ சேர்ந்து முதலிலே யோசித்து கொள்ளவேண்டும். அப்படி இல்லாமல் நாம் ஏதோ செய்ய வேண்டும் என்ற எண்ணத்துடன் செய்தால் நாம் அவ்வாறு செய்யத் தவறிப்போய்விடுகிறோம் என்பதைச் சட்டக் காட்டாமல் இருக்க முடியவில்லை.

“ கடன் நிவாரணச் சட்டம் வந்த பிறகு என்ன நடக்கிறதென்று பார்க்கும்போது 100 ரூபாய் கடன் வாங்க வேண்டுமென்றால் ரூ. 200-க்கு பத்திரம் எழுதிக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும். விவசாயிகளுக்கு அரை வட்டிக்கு கடன் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று செய்தோம். ஆனால், இப்பொழுது என்ன நடக்கிறது? 3½ சத வட்டியை முன்னடியே எடுத்துக்கொண்டுவிடுகிறார்கள். அந்த வட்டிக்குக்கூட பணம் கிடைப்பதில்லை. இம்மாதிரியான நிலையிலே விவசாயிகளுக்குப் பண வசதி செய்து கொடுக்க வேண்டியது அவசியம்.

“ விவசாயம் செய்வதற்குத் தகுதியான Economic units வேண்டும். இல்லாவிட்டால் பயிரிடமுடியாது. அதற்குத் தகுந்த முறையிலே அரசாங்கம் செய்யப் பிரயத்தனம் செய்கிறது. ஆனால், இந்த நாட்டில் எவ்வளவு அதிக நிலம் இருக்கிறது, பிரித்துக் கொடுக்கும்போது எவ்வளவு பேருக்குக் கொடுக்க முடியும், எவ்வளவு நிலப் பரப்பு அவர்களுக்கு வந்து சேர்ந்து அவர்களுடைய பொருளாதார நிலை முன்னேற்றம் அடைய முடியும் என்று பார்க்கும் போது அது ரொம்ப சந்தேகமாகத் தான் இருக்கிறது.

“ பத்து ரூபாய்க்கு உட்பட்டு நிலவரி செலுத்தும் பட்டாதார்கள் இந்த ராஜ்யத்தில் 50 சத வீதத்திற்கு மேல் இருக்கிறார்கள். பத்து ரூபாய் நில வரி செலுத்துபவர் என்றால் நஞ்சையாயிருந்தால் அரை ஏக்கரும், புஞ்சையாயிருந்தால் 4 அல்லது 5 ஏக்கரும் இருக்கும். அதற்கு மேல் இருக்காது. இதிலிருந்து அவனுடைய குடும்பத்தை நடத்த முடியாது. ஆனால், பதில் சொல்லலாம் : ‘ நிலம் இல்லாதவர்கள் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறார்களே, கொஞ்சமாவது நிலம் சொந்தமாகக் கொடுத்தால் தானே பரவாயில்லை ’ என்று சொல்லலாம். கொஞ்சமாவது கொடுத்தால் முன்னேற்றம் அடைய முடியுமா? அதற்கு என்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று பார்க்க வேண்டும். நிலத்தில் உழைத்து ஜீவனம் நடத்த விரும்பும் குடியானவர்களின் பொருளாதார நிலையை முன்னேற்றுவதற்கு நாம் நிலத்தை மாத்திரம் பங்கிட்டுக் கொடுத்து, அதிலிருந்து முன்னேற்றம் அடைய முடியுமா என்று யோசித்தால் இந்த ராஜ்யத்திலே முடியாது. புள்ளி விவரங்களைப் பார்த்தால் தெரியும். மத்திய சர்க்கார் புள்ளி விவரத்தைச் சேகரித்தார்கள். நமது ராஜ்ய அரசாங்கமும் சேகரித்தார்கள். இந்த நிலையிலே இருக்கும்போது அவர்களுக்கு வேறு துறையிலேயும் பணம் சம்பாதித்து அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கையை நடத்துவதற்கு வசதி செய்தாலொழிய நிலத்திலிருந்து மாத்திரம் செய்தால் பிரயோஜனம் இல்லை. நாம் பெரும்பான்மையான கிராம மக்களுக்கு எந்த விதத்திலேயும் பொருளாதார நிலையில் முன்னேற்றம் அடையச் செய்ய முடியாது. அதற்காக இந்த சட்டம் வேண்டாமென்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை. சட்டம் வேண்டும். இதனால் என்ன பலன் வரும் என்பதையும் நாம் யோசிக்க வேண்டும்.

“ குத்தகைக்கோ வாரத்திற்கோ நிலத்தை எடுத்துப் பயிரிடுபவர்கள் 14 சத வீதம் இந்த ராஜ்யத்தில் இருப்பார்கள். மற்றவர்களெல்லாம் சொந்தப் பண்ணையை வைத்துக்கொண்டு நடத்துகிறார்கள். பட்டாதார்கள்

8th August 1955] [Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar]

கணக்கை வைத்துக்கொண்டு பார்த்தால் தெரியும், 5, 6 வருஷங்களுக்கு முன்னால் சேகரித்த புள்ளி விவரங்களை வைத்துக்கொண்டு நான் இதைச் சொல்லுகிறேன். நமது சர்க்கார் சேகரித்த சமீபத்திய புள்ளி விவரங்களைப் பார்த்தால் தெரியும். ஆந்திர ராஜ்யம் பிரிக்கப்படாதபோது சேகரித்த புள்ளிவிவரங்களைக் கொண்டு நான் சொல்கிறேன். ஆந்திர ராஜ்யம் பிரிக்கப்பட்ட பிறகு இன்னும் மோசமாக இருக்கும். ஆந்திர ராஜ்யத்தில் பெரிய நிலச்சுவாந்தார்கள் நம்மை விட அதிகம் என்பதையும் நாம் மறந்து விடக்கூடாது. ஜன சங்கியை ரீதியில் எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் ஒவ்வொரு விவசாயிக்கும் சராசரி எவ்வளவு ஏக்கர் இருக்கிறதென்று தெரியும். அதையும் நீங்கள் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். மாகாண சர்க்கார் மாத்திரம் இது விஷயத்தில் ஏதாவது செய்துவிட முடியும் என்று மத்திய சர்க்கார் நினைத்தால் அது பகல் கனவாகத்தான் போய் விடும். அவர்களும் ஏதாவது தகுந்த முறையில் பிரயத்தனம் செய்தாலொழிய ஏழ்மை, அறியாமை, திறமையின்மை இவைகளைத்தான் பங்கிட்டுக்கொள்ள முடியும். வேறு எதையும் பங்கிட்டுக்கொள்ள முடியாது. சட்டத்தை மாத்திரம் செய்துவிட்டு பேசாமல் இருந்தால் ஒன்றும் நடக்காது.

“ இருக்கும் நிலம் எவ்வளவு, அதிலிருந்து எத்தனை விவசாயிகளுக்கு நிலத்தைப் பட்டா செய்து கொடுக்க முடியும், எத்தனை பேர் உண்மையிலேயே பொருளாதார நிலையில் முன்னேற்றம் அடைய முடியும், அதற்குத் தகுந்த நிலப் பரப்பு எவ்வளவு இருக்க வேண்டும், எவ்வளவு நிலப் பரப்பு இருந்தால் தன்னுடைய குடும்பத்தை ஒரு விவசாயி நடத்த முடியும், எந்த முறையில் அவர்களுக்கு எவ்வளவு பணம் அதிகமாக வருவாய் செய்ய முடியும் என்பதை யோசிக்க வேண்டும். அப்படி யோசிக்காமல் நாம் சுட்சி மனப்பான்மையிலேயே சட்டம் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று செய்து விட்டால் அது நான் சொன்ன விபரீத நிலைக்கு கொண்டு போய்விடுவிடும்.

“ உலகத்திலுள்ள எல்லா நாடுகளிலும் எப்படி நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யப்பட்டது? அமெரிக்கா, இங்கிலாந்து, ஜெர்மனி போன்ற நாடுகளை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் அங்கெல்லாம் **Economic unit** என்ன என்பதை நிர்ணயித்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு பண்ணையானது எவ்வளவு ஏக்கருக்குக் குறைந்து இருக்கக்கூடாதென்று சட்டம் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு குடும்பத்தை நடத்துவதற்கு ஒருவன் நன்றாக வாழ்க்கை நடத்துவதற்கு தேவையைக்கொண்டு அவன் எப்படி வாழ்க்கை நடத்த முடியும் என்று நிர்ணயித்திருக்கிறார்கள். அமெரிக்காவில் 168 ஏக்கரும், இங்கிலாந்தில் 50 ஏக்கரும், ஜெர்மனியில் 50 ஏக்கரும் (**economic unit**) என்று நிர்ணயம் செய்து, அதற்குக் குறைந்த நிலப்பரப்பு இருந்தால் விவசாயம் செய்யமுடியாது என்று சட்டம் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த நிலையிலே இருக்கும்போது எவ்வளவு பேருக்கு 40, 50 ஏக்கராவது கொடுக்க முடியும் என்று பார்த்தால் ஒன்றும் இருக்காது. 1,000-ல் 2 பேர் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களையும் இந்த நிலைமைக்குக் கொண்டுவருவதுதான் ஆகும். ஆகையால், இது விஷயத்தில் யோசனை செய்து நிர்ணயிக்க வேண்டும். அதற்காக அதிகமாக வைத்துக்கொண்டு இருப்பவர்களை அப்படியே விட்டுவிடவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லவில்லை. அவரவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை நிலை **standard of living** க்குத் தகுந்தபடி நிர்ணயம் செய்யவேண்டும். ரஷ்யாவில் கூட அவரவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்திற்குத் தகுந்தாற்போல்தான் நிலவுடைமைக்கு வாழ்வு கட்டியிருக்கிறார்கள். கீழ்த்தர சிப்பந்திக்கும் மேலே இருக்கிறவருக்கும் ஒன்றுக்குப் பத்து மடங்கு வித்தியாசத்தைக்கூட அனுமதிக்கிறார்கள் ரஷ்யாவில். சீனாவிற்கும் ஜனநாயக அந்தஸ்து (**Democratic status**) ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அங்கும் இம்மாதிரித்தான் ஏதோ வித்தியாசம் இருந்து வருகிறது. ஆகவே, திடீரென்று ஒரே நாளில் நாம் எல்லோரும் சமமாகப் போய்விட முடியாது. நல்ல எண்ணந்தான். ஆனால், அதைச் செய்யமுடியுமா என்பதையும் யோசிக்க வேண்டும். ஆகவே யோசித்துச்

[Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar] [8th August 1955]

செய்யவேண்டும். பல துறைகளிலே நீங்கள் யோசித்து செய்ய ஆரம்பித் தால் இப்பொழுது இருக்கிற பட்டாதார்களுக்கு இதன் மூலமாக நன்மை செய்ய முடியும் என்று யோசிக்கவேண்டும்.

“ உப தொழில்களிலும் விவசாயிகளை ஈடுபடுத்த வேண்டும். அந்தத் தொழில்களில் அவர்களுக்கு ஆர்வம் உண்டாகும்படியான முறையிலே, தகுந்த பாதுகாப்பு கொடுத்து, தகுந்த சூழ்நிலையை உண்டாக்கி, வசதி செய்து கொடுத்தால் விவசாயிகளுடைய பொருளாதார நிலையை உயர்த்தி நன்றாக வாழ்க்கை நடத்த முடியும். விவசாயமும் செவ்வனே நடைபெறும். அதற்கு நம் இடத்திலே என்ன வசதி இருக்கிறது. அதை என்னென்ன முறையிலே செய்யலாமென்பதையும் யோசிக்க வேண்டும்.

3.150
p.m. “ இந்த ராஜ்யத்திலுள்ள விவசாயிகளை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் 1,000-ல் 1 அல்லது 2 பேர் தவிர மற்றவர்களுடைய பொருளாதார நிலை ரொம்ப மோசமாக இருக்கிறது. அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை ரொம்ப கஷ்ட நிலையில் இருக்கிறது. அவர்களுக்கு ஏதாவது செய்ய வேண்டும் என்பது ரொம்ப நியாயம். விவசாயத் தொழிலுக்குத் தகுந்த வசதியும், அவர்களுக்குப் பயிற்சியும் வேண்டும். அரசாங்கமும் சமூகமும் அதற்குத் தகுந்த முறையிலே உதவியும் செய்ய வேண்டும். அதைச் செய்வது தவிர, ஆங்காங்கே பள்ளிக்கூடங்களிலே என்ன சொல்லிக் கொடுக்கிறோம்? உத்தியோகத்திற்கு ஒருவருக்கொருவர் சண்டை போட்டுக்கொண்டு, ஜாதி, சமய, மொழிச் சண்டைகளில் ஈடுபடுவதற்குச் சொல்லிக் கொடுக்கிறோம். அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கையை நடத்துவதற்குத் தகுந்த முறையிலே அவர்களுக்குப் பயிற்சி கொடுப்பது இல்லை. ஒரே நாளில் அப்படிச் செய்துவிட முடியாது. ரொம்பக் கஷ்டம்தான். இருந்தாலும் இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டத்திலே இந்த விஷயத்தை இன்னும் அதிகமாகக் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். கவனித்து தகுந்த முறையில் எவ்வளவு தூரம் செய்யமுடியும் என்பதை யோசித்து பட்டாதார் எவ்வளவு பேர்களுக்கு நிலத்தின் மூலமாக வாழ்க்கை நடத்த முடியும் என்று யோசித்து சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யவேண்டும்.

“ பள்ளிக்கூடங்களிலுள்ள குழந்தைகளுக்கு சாப்பாடு போடுவதற்கேற்ற முறையில் பள்ளிக்கூடங்களுக்குச் சொந்தமாக நிலங்களை ஒதுக்கி அதிலிருந்து குழந்தைகளுக்கு சாப்பாடு எவ்வளவு தூரம் கொடுக்க முடியும் என்பதைப் பரிசீலிப்பதற்காக அரசாங்கம் ஒரு கமிட்டியை நியமித்திருக்கிறார்கள். எத்தனை பேருக்கு சாப்பாடு போட முடியும் என்பதையும் யோசிக்க வேண்டும். புஞ்சை எவ்வளவு, நஞ்சை எவ்வளவு வேண்டும், ஆகமொத்தம் எவ்வளவு நிலப்பரப்பு இருக்க வேண்டும். நீர்ப்பாசன வசதியுள்ள இடங்களில், ஜீவ நதி பாயக்கூடிய இடங்களில் எவ்வளவு நிலம் இருந்தால் பரவாயில்லை, புஞ்சைக் காடுகளாக இருந்தால் எவ்வளவு நிலம் இருந்தால் ஒரு குடும்பத்தை நடத்தலாம் என்பதை யெல்லாம் யோசிக்கவேண்டும். எவ்வளவு ஏக்கர் என்று போட்டால் கூட பிரயோஜனம் இல்லை. குத்தகையாளர்களுக்குச் சட்டம் செய்யும் போது குத்தகை சாகுபடியாளர்கள் எவ்வளவு பேர்கள் சரியான முறையில் வாழ்க்கையை நடத்த முடியும் என்பதைப் பார்த்து முடிவு செய்ய வேண்டும். என்னென்றால் திட்டம் (planing) வகுக்கிறோம். ஆகவே, எல்லா அம்சங்களையும் சீர்தாக்கிப் பார்த்துதான் செய்ய வேண்டும். தனி மனிதனை இருந்தால் அதைப்பற்றி குறைகூறுவதற்கு முடியாது. அவன் தலை விதி என்று நினைத்துக்கொள்ளுவான். ஆனால், இப்பொழுது முதல் ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டம் முடியும் தருவாயில் இருக்கிறது. இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டம் வகுக்கப்படுகிறது. அனேக சீர்திருத்தங்கள் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று நினைக்கிறோம். வசதிகளைச் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று நினைக்கிறோம். அந்த வசதிகளை எந்தெந்தத் துறையிலே எவ்வளவு செய்ய முடியும், நம்முடைய limitation என்ன, விவசாயிகளுடைய (limitation) என்ன, கூட்டுறவு சங்கங்கள் எவ்வளவு தூரம் கடன் கொடுக்கத் தயாராய் இருக்கின்றன, நாம் எவ்வளவு தூரம் அரசாங்கத்தின் மூலமாக, மத்திய சர்க்கார் எவ்வளவு ஒத்தாசை செய்யத் தயாராய் இருக்கிறது என்பதை நன்றாக யோசிக்க வில்லை என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

8th August 1955] [Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar]

இதுதான் என்னுடைய சிறிய புத்திக்கு படுகிறது. சென்ற 6, 7 வருஷங்களாக சரியான முறையிலே அதை அணுகி சரியான முறையிலே செய்ய வில்லை என்பது தான் என்னுடைய தாழ்மையான அபிப்பிராயம். (Tenancy reform) வேண்டாமென்று சொல்லவில்லை. செய்யும் போது எவ்வளவு பேர் நன்றாக வாழ்க்கை நடத்தலாம் என்பதை யோசித்துச் செய்யுங்கள் என்றுதான் சொல்லுகிறேன்.

“ ஒருவர் இவ்வளவு நிலத்திற்கு மேல் வைத்திருக்கக்கூடாது என்று (ceiling) நிர்ணயம் செய்யும்போது எந்தெந்த பிரதேசத்தில் எவ்வளவு ஏக்கர் நிலம் என்பது தெரியவேண்டும். என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம் என்னவென்றால், வருவாய் எவ்வளவு வருகிறது. அந்த வருவாய்க்கு நாம் (assurance) கொடுத்திருக்கிறோம் என்று பார்க்க வேண்டும். நிலத்தைப் பயிரிடும்போது சாலியாஸ்ப் போய்விட்டால் அந்த நஷ்டத்தைச் சமாளிப்பதற்கு (crop insurance) வேண்டும். கால் நடை நோய் நொடியினால் இறந்துவிடுகிறது. அந்த நஷ்டத்தை விவசாயிகள் ஈடுகட்டிக்கொள்வதற்கு, தொடர்ந்து விவசாயத்தைச் செய்வதற்கு (Cattle insurance) இருக்க வேண்டும். இம்மாதிரியான முறையில் வேண்டிய ஏற்பாடுகளைச் செய்துவிட்டு, அதன் பிறகு (ceiling) நிர்ணயம் செய்தால் நன்றாக இருக்கும்.

“ இந்த ராஜ்யத்தில் 100-க்கு 90 விவசாயிகள் ஏழ்மை நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். விவசாயம் செய்வதற்கு வசதி இல்லாத நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுடைய ஏழ்மை நாளுக்கு நாள் அதிகமாகிக் கொண்டு வருகிறது. ஆகையால், நாம் முன்னே இந்த ராஜ்யத்திலே எவ்வளவு கடன் ஏற்பட்டது என்பதையும், இப்பொழுது என்ன கடன் இருக்கிறதென்பதையும் ஒப்பிட்டுப் பார்க்கும்போது 7, 8 வருஷங்களாக வில்லாகி உயர்ந்திருந்தபோதிலுங்கூட ஏழை விவசாயி ஏன் பொருளாதார நிலையில் உயரவில்லை? பெரும்பான்மையான நிலங்கள் ஜல வசதி இல்லாத நிலங்களாக இருப்பதால் 7, 8 வருஷங்களாக பஞ்சம் ஏற்பட்டு தொந்தரவுக்காளாகி கடனைக் கொடுக்க முடியாமல் வாழ்க்கை நடத்த முடியாத நிலையில் இருந்து வந்தார்கள். ஒரு வருஷம், சென்ற வருஷம் கொஞ்சம் மழை பெய்து, விவசாயிகளுடைய நிலை ஓரளவுக்கு உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. ஆகையால் இப்படி பல துறைகளில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு மாத்திரம் (sinking fund) வேண்டாமா, என்று எல்லோரும் சேர்ந்து அவர்களை (sink) பண்ணிவிடுகிறார்கள். சமூகத்திலே வியாபாரியும் அப்படித்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களுக்கு வாழ்க்கை வேண்டும். அவனுக்கு மட்டும் வாழ்க்கை வேண்டாமா? வேண்டும். ஏன் விவசாயிகளுக்கு மட்டும் வாழ்க்கை வசதி செய்துகொடுக்கப்படவில்லை? ஏனென்றால், அவர்கள் அதிகமாக கூச்சல் போடுவதில்லை. தலை விதியே என்று அவர்கள் இருந்து விடுகிறார்கள். அதனால் தான் அவர்கள் மீது ஏறி உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டு அழுக்குகிறார்கள். இந்த நிலையில் நாம் இதை எல்லோரும் யோசித்து தகுந்த முறையிலே சட்டத்தை செய்தால் 100-க்கு 10 பங்கு வறுமையை நீக்கி விவசாயிகளுடைய நிலையை மேலுக்குக் கொண்டுவர முடியும். 100-க்கு 90 பங்கு மேலுக்குக் கொண்டு வர முடியாது. குடிசைத் தொழில்கள், மத்தியதரத் தொழில்கள் ஆகிய இம்மாதிரி தொழில்களை ஆங்காங்கே பரவலான முறையில் கிராமங்களிலே நடத்தவேண்டும்.

“ சர்வகலாசாலைகள் கிராமங்களில் வரவேண்டும். அந்தச் சூழ்நிலையில் அவர்களுக்குத் தகுந்த வசதி வரும். நாகரீகமோ அநாகரீகமோ நாகரீகத்தின் பேரால் நகரங்களில் சர்வ கலாசாலைகள் இருப்பதால் வாழ்க்கைத் தரம் மேலே போகிறது. நகரங்களில் இருப்பவர்களைப் பார்த்து கிராமங்களில் உள்ளவர்கள் பாதிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள். நகரத்தில் இருப்பவர்களைப் பார்த்து கிராமங்களில் இருப்பவர்கள் காப்பி அடிக்கிறார்கள். நாகரீகத்தின் பேரால். அந்த நிலையிலே நாம் செய்யவேண்டியது என்ன? கிராமச் சூழ்நிலையில் சர்வ கலாசாலைகள் ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டும், தொழிற்சாலைகளை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டும், விவசாயப் பண்ணைகளை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டும்.

[Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar] [8th August 1955]

எல்லா இடத்திலும் ஏற்படுத்தி அதில் யார் யார் கொஞ்சம் நிலம் கொடுக்கிறார்களோ அந்தத் துறையிலே அவர்களை வேலை செய்யும்படியாகச் செய்து, தூண்டுதல் செய்து, ஜனங்களுடத்தில் நம்பிக்கை உண்டாக்க வேண்டும். விவசாயப் பண்ணைகளுக்கு ஜனங்கள் வருவது இல்லை. செல வழிக்கிறார்கள், நம்மால் முடியாது என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அந்த நிலையிலே சூழ்நிலைக்குத் தகுந்த முறையிலே விவசாயிக்குக் கொஞ்சம் நிலம் கொடுத்து அதன் மூலமாக பண்ணையை நடத்த வேண்டும். வேண்டுமானால் (technical advice) கொடுக்கலாம். விவசாயிகளை வைத்து விவசாயப் பண்ணைகளை நடத்தினால் மற்றவர்கள் நம்புவார்கள். உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களை வைத்து நடத்தினால் ஜனங்கள் நம்புவது இல்லை. அதையும் நீங்கள் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். அதேமாதிரி தொழிற்சாலைகளும் இருக்க வேண்டும். எல்லாப் பள்ளிக்கூடங்களிலும் தொழிற் படிப்பு கொடுக்க வேண்டும். பத்து கிராமங்களுக்கு ஒரு தொழிற் பள்ளிக்கூடம் இருக்கலாம். அம்மாதிரி கிராமச் சூழ்நிலைக்குத் தகுந்த முறையிலே, கிராமக் கைத்தொழில்களையும், மத்தியதரக் கைத்தொழில்களையும் ஆங்காங்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்து அந்தத் தொழில்களில் விவசாயிகளுக்குப் பயிற்சி கொடுத்தால் 10, 20 வருஷங்களில் முன்னேற்றம் காண முடியும். இதைக் கவனித்துச் செய்தால் நன்றாக இருக்கும். அரசாங்கத்தைக் குறைகூறுவதற்காக நான் சொல்ல வில்லை. இருக்கும் நிலையில் எந்தெந்த முறையிலே விவசாயிகளின் நிலையை முன்னுக்குக் கொண்டுவர முடியும் என்று யோசித்துச் செய்யவேண்டும். பகட்டு மேனிக் குச் செய்தால் பிரயோஜனம் இல்லை. ஆகையால் அதையும் கவனித்து நாம் (tenancy reform) செய்யவேண்டும். பொருளாதார நிலையை முன்னேற்றவேண்டியதைக் கவனத்தில் வைத்து சீர்திருத்தம் செய்ய வேண்டும். சிறு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களுடைய பொருளாதார நிலை இப்பொழுது இருப்பதை விட இன்னும் அதிகமாக வருவதற்கு (protection) செய்யவேண்டும். அந்த வகையில் அரசாங்கம் சீர்திருத்தங்கள் கொண்டு வரும் என்ற நம்பிக்கையில் என்னுடைய வார்த்தையை இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as usual, saw something sinister in this move on the part of the Government. That has become a sort of habit with him, Sir and he has to get on and I have also to get on. (Laughter.) I will try to meet the points raised by him.

“ In the first place, he said that this is a ruse in order to postpone the question of land reforms and that we have come this year with a legislation for prevention of evictions and that we will come next year with another legislation and so on and so forth. I may tell him, Sir, that we are very earnest in bringing comprehensive land reforms and we are taking much pains in looking at the various features and other statistics on this question.”

DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ Sir, may I know for how many years is the Hon. Minister taking pains? ”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—“ For as many years as I am here. (Laughter.) Many a day we discussed this question and then came to a sort of a tentative proposal about this. In fact, Sir, we were about to publish it in the form of a White paper, but suddenly we stumbled on constitutional and legal difficulties. That is why the White paper could not be published.”

8th August 1955]

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Difficulties created by whom? "

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—" Difficulties created by the Constitution. Difficulties will be further created by friends like Dr. John. That is why we have to be guarded. (Laughter.) The Hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has gathered all the information and knowledge by reading books—English Act or American Act. • But as far as I am concerned, I did not read any book. I had not been to England or America. I gathered all the information in my own place as a man who lived in villages, talked with the villagers, and knew the various difficulties of the villagers. I feel that this knowledge is much more useful than all the bookish knowledge of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" May I ask, Sir, whether reading books is a disadvantage? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sometimes it is a disadvantage."

DR. A. SREENIVASAN :—" One is supposed to lose one's originality by reading books! "

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—" One of the main objects of the reform is to have larger production. That aspect is kept in mind and not forgotten. It is also our aim to distribute the land to as many as possible—small peasant proprietors. That is also the ideal. We should see that tenants are elevated to the position of proprietors. Taking all these into consideration, we prepared a sort of scheme. But that could not be brought in. Pending that bigger question, we have had recourse to this Bill in order that there may not be disturbances in the country. However slight they may be, they are disturbances. We do not want to have them. Some time ago, we brought forward a similar Bill as regards South Kanara. One hon. Member asked, ' Why should we not extend the provisions of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannayals Protection Act to other areas also? ' That could not be done, Sir, because the Tanjore Act could apply only to Tanjore and neighbouring districts. As a matter of fact, there was difficulty in Tirunelveli district, and the Tanjore Act could not be of any avail. That is why this Bill has been brought forward. Then the hon. Member said, ' Well; if eviction is to take place, it takes place only through courts '. He asked whether I could give any statistics about the number of evictions that were unjustly made, etc. Evictions could be done by courts. That is one way. But there are other ways also of evicting tenants—subtler and finer—without putting any money into the pockets of friends like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. We want to prevent such evictions also. The tenant is tilling the land. But the landholder, in anticipation of the land reform says ' No ' to the tiller. He says, ' You need

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu] [8th August 1955]

not till', and the tenant is dispensed with. If this is done on a large scale, it will lead to disturbances which will affect the agricultural economy of the whole State. The Government cannot sit quiet about it. These disturbances will not only affect the law and order situation but also food production. That is why the Government have to step in and prevent all unlawful evictions. Any honest man who regularly pays rent, etc., should not be evicted. Only that man who defaults or who uses the land in a manner prejudicial to the proper cultivation of the land, can be legitimately evicted. Therefore a legislation like this is necessary, and I do not see any reason why the hon. Member objects to it.

"The hon. Member from South Arcot, our ex-Chief Minister, gave us very valuable ideas and suggestions. I like them and I also thank him for those suggestions. But at the same time I must tell him that when he was at the helm of affairs here with far greater powers, prestige and influence than I have, what did he do? He was not able to do anything substantial. He had very many good ideas. But he was not able to translate them into action. That is because there is difficulty. (Interruption.) I am not accusing him for that. But there are difficulties when one is in office, which difficulties are not there when one is not in office. Though he was well meaning and wanted to do something, he was not able to do it. He was yearning to do something. But he could not do it. Had he continued in office, the land reform would have been put on the Statute Book much earlier. That is my impression. He also spoke about fragmentation. He quoted from America and Germany and other places to support his argument. Here also I think there is provision to prevent fragmentation. But we are not able to enforce it, because the population here is great. In America and England, the pressure on land is not so great. So they can fix 160 acres as an economic unit. We cannot fix even 3 acres as an economic unit. If all available lands are to be distributed, we cannot have even a fraction of an acre to be given to each man.

"Coming now to the question of rural credit, I say, Sir, that this is a very great problem in our country. That is ruining our peasantry. We have been trying to deal with this problem for the last twenty or thirty years, and we have not been able to tackle it satisfactorily. We can reduce the rate of interest, but the creditor knows how to get over this. He will deduct the interest while making the advance, and thus overcome the provisions of the law. But still the Government are trying their best to increase the credit facilities. Rural banks are being opened in many parts of the country. I hope then there will be better facilities for credit, but this will take some time. We cannot all on a sudden change the state of affairs that have been existing for a number of years. Therefore, we will have to wait patiently and try our best."

8th August 1955]

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" How long are we to wait? "

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—" As long as the Hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and myself live, we can try. Only after that we cannot try. (Laughter.) We shall try our best as long as we live.

" Reference was made to other matters pertaining to the larger question of land reform. We are now concerned with this Bill which only aims at the prevention of evictions. If we confine ourselves to this, our task is rendered simple. There are certain doubts and difficulties to be cleared. That we will attend to at the Joint Select Committee stage. I hope hon. Members serving on the Joint Select Committee will do their best to overcome these difficulties and co-operate with us in passing this legislation.

" I need not say anything further, Sir, and I commend this motion to the acceptance of this House."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The question is—

'That this House concurs with the Assembly in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses consisting of 30 Members (20 Members of the Assembly and 10 Members of the Council) to consider the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Bill, 1955 (L.A. Bill No. 11 of 1955) and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee :—

The Hon. Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam.

Sri K. Bhashyam.

Sri A. M. Allapichai.

Sri T. Purushotham.

Sri T. G. Krishnamoorthi.

Sri N. Nallasenapathi Sarkarai Manradia.

Dr. V. K. John.

Sri Mohamed Raza Khan.

Sri A. Gajapathy Nayagar.

Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar."

The motion was carried.

V.—NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

Resolution.

REMOVAL OF DISPARITY IN SCALES OF PAY AS AMONG TEACHERS OF THE SAME QUALIFICATIONS IN VARIOUS SCHOOLS UNDER THE VARIOUS AGENCIES.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY :—" Sir, I move—

'This Council recommends to the Government that the disparity in scales of pay as among teachers of the same qualifications in the various schools under the various agencies in the State be removed by up-grading.'

4-10
p.m.

[8th August 1955]

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" I second the resolution. May I also make a suggestion, Sir, that we sit till 5 of the clock and continue the same agenda on the next non-official day? "

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" We may be agreeable but that is against the Council Rules. Any resolution left unfinished to-day will be taken over to the next non-official day. In the case of other resolutions, we will have to hold a ballot again."

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY :—" The object of this resolution is to remove the disparity in scales of pay as among teachers of the same qualifications. Hon. Members of this House are aware that education in this State is at present managed by five different agencies—Government, District Board, Municipality, Panchayat and aided agencies. Nearly fifty per cent of the teachers belong to the last category, aided agencies. Now, the teachers can be broadly divided into three categories—those who pass the S.S.L.C. Examination and get two years training and are called secondary grade teachers, those who pass any Form from III to VI and get two years' training and are called higher grade teachers, and those who pass B.A. or M.A. and undergo B.T. or L.T. training and are called graduate teachers. Teachers of the same category are paid different salaries when they work under different agencies. We have no quarrel with the agencies. In fact, we want the different agencies to continue. Just as we feel the hand only so long as the fingers in our hand are different in length and strength, education will be useful only if different agencies run it. In India where we have different faiths and different religions, we do want different agencies to organise education. But we do not want disparity in scales of pay. Let us analyse the question, whether the disparity is only on account of the existence of different agencies; on analysis we find that it is not so. We shall go deeper and see whether it is due to the pattern of a particular agency that the disparity exists. If we do that we find that this is not so. For example in one and the same school in the City of Madras, teachers of the same qualifications are paid different scales of pay. So we can come to only one conclusion, the right conclusion, that the departmental rules have been the cause of disparity in scales of pay among teachers of the same qualifications.

" Now let me cite certain figures for the information of hon. Members. I was speaking of the higher grade teachers. There is another type of teachers called the lower grade teachers. The latter category was given some training which was stopped some 30 or 35 years ago and taken into service. There are 2,500 such teachers in the State. When they are employed in an aided institution, there is no scale of pay for them. The salary is paid from out of the grants given by the Government. So, the lower elementary school teacher to-day gets a fixed pay of Rs. 20 in the year 1955. Hon. Members may be surprised to hear that this teacher is not to get any increment at all."

8th August 1955]

SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAI :—" Are they not paid any dearness allowance? "

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY :—" They get Rs. 18. But if they work in a municipal or local body school they get the scale, Rs. 23—33. If they are in Government service, they get the scale Rs. 23—35. Therefore, a person of similar qualifications, if employed by Government in a Harijan Welfare School gets Rs. 35. I have been trying to bring much pressure on the Government to give the man employed in the aided institution at least a scale which is given to the other grades. But the Government have not cared to listen to my request, so far.

" Taking the case of the higher grade teachers of whom we have such a large number as over 50,000 in this State, we will find that they are paid in the scale of Rs. 30— $\frac{1}{2}$ —33, if they are in aided institutions. That is, the grade starts at Rs. 30 and that with the addition of the three rupees sanctioned last April. The managements that run the school are not obliged to pay them a pie more than what the Government give. The Government can question them only if they withhold anything from the grant given by the Government but cannot compel them to pay more to the teachers if they are not prepared to pay anything from out of the school fees collected. The same teacher, if he works under a municipality or a district board is started on Rs. 30 and the grade goes up to Rs. 45. If he works in a Government school he is started on Rs. 30 and goes up to Rs. 50."

SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAI :—" What is the scale? "

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY :—" Rs. 30—1—50. Hon. Members can easily realise what a difference it would be for a person employed in an aided institution who gets only Rs. 33, that is Rs. 17 less than what a Government teacher gets.

" Taking a secondary grade teacher, matric-trained, if he gets into an aided institution, he can be paid either the local body scale or the Government scale. If he enters a municipal or district board institution after passing the S.S.L.C. examination and undergoing two years' training, he gets the scale Rs. 45—2—85 if it is a high school. The same teacher, if he works in an elementary school gets only Rs. 40 and his grade goes up to Rs. 75. He is started Rs. 5 less and there is a difference of Rs. 10 in the maximum. Hon. Members may be surprised to hear that a matriculate teacher who after two years' training starts life as an elementary school teacher has got to work for 220 days in a year whereas his brother who works for 180 days in a high school gets Rs. 5 per month extra and also gets Rs. 10 extra in the maximum. If a teacher starts life in a Government school he starts with Rs. 45 per mensem irrespective of the fact whether he works in an elementary or high school. There the Government have done the right thing. There the teacher goes up to Rs. 90. So far about the matriculate teachers. Let me now come to the graduate teachers.

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [8th August 1955]

“Graduate teachers are there working in local boards’ schools, aided schools and Government schools. The Government question the aided managements only if they pay the graduate teachers less than the local board scale. The teachers working in the local board schools whether they are B.A.L.Ts. or M.A.L.Ts. (there is no distinction between the two) are given the scale of Rs. 75—5—145. If the same teacher works in a Government school, he is given the scale of Rs. 85—175. There is thus a difference of Rs. 10 in the starting pay and there is as much difference as Rs. 30 in the maximum. Therefore while a graduate teacher is working in the local board school in the scale 75—5—145, his other colleague who has joined a Government school reaches the maximum of Rs. 145 much earlier than himself. When this kind of discrimination was pointed out, it was said at a deputation that differences there were even among the secretarial and ministerial staff and that it was after all luck that took a teacher to a Government, local body or aided school. But I ask with the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society, whether such kind of discrimination is shown amongst Government servants? Do they distinguish between a clerk working in Tiruchirappalli and a clerk working in other districts. Is there such a distinction among clerks in the Sub-Registrar’s office and clerks in Revenue offices working in different districts. There is another reason to avoid disparity. Unfortunately the teachers have got a particular disability. Opportunities of promotion are not there for the teachers. A B.A.L.T. or M.A.L.T. cannot go beyond Rs. 175 in case he works in a Government school and beyond Rs. 145 if he works in a local board school, even if he be a man of merit or of exceptional ability. But the same is not the case with regard to Government servants. A clerk who enters service in the Revenue Department, were he to exhibit merit, could rise to very high positions as Deputy Collector and in the post-war days even as District Collector. But such an opportunity is not there for the teacher. If at all he could hope to get anything, it is the maximum in his scale. That is all. In the case of secondary-grade teachers he could rise only up to Rs. 90. There it stops. No more chance of promotion or anything like that is there for that poor teacher. He has to be content with Rs. 90 for the rest of his life.

“Teachers are treated as five different castes under a Secular Government, which stands for justice and equality. When such a disparity is there among the teachers who do the same kind of work, can we say that there is equal pay for equal work? Can we say that there is equality of opportunity? Even teachers of a particular category have the same general and technical qualifications. They teach the same kind of boys (Indian), handle the same syllabus presented by the department and are inspected by the same officers of the Education Department. But in spite of all these, we are treated as five different castes in a Secular Government. It is high time that these disparities in the matter of

8th August 1955] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

pay between teachers who possess the same qualification and who are working in a local board or aided school and a Government school, are removed. These different agencies have come into being somehow and we have to perpetuate them because we cannot close all these schools and bring them under one agency overnight. I quite realize the responsibilities and difficulties of the Government. But surely the Government can ask the managements of these aided and other schools, to give the teachers the scale of pay obtaining in Government schools. On account of the educational concessions recently announced by Government, the managements of the aided schools stand to benefit in one sense. What they lose by their not receiving any fee from the pupils up to the third form is gained by the Government making good the loss suffered by the management. I know that there are elementary schools in the City of Madras who are collecting tuition fees ranging from Re. 1 onwards from the pupils. But the Government have told them that because education has been made free to the children of all poor people whose monthly income is less than Rs. 100, they would make good the loss sustained by the management. Therefore these managements do not suffer by the educational concessions announced by Government. I know and I am subject to correction that there are no rules prescribed by Government for the accounting of the surplus of these aided schools. Government do not ask for accounts of surplus institutions. When these institutions are surplus and when they are paying the teachers less pay than that paid in Government schools for teachers with the same qualification and who handle the same classes, can we say that no discrimination has been made between teachers? Hon. Members may wonder that one Krishnamoorthi has to plead for avoidance of disparity in scales of Rs. 20 and Rs. 30 more, which is a pittance in these days of costly living. But, Sir, that is the lot of the teachers. We can imagine the condition of a secondary-grade teacher in an aided elementary school whose grade is only Rs. 40—1—48. He stops at Rs. 48 whereas a teacher of the same qualification in a Government school goes up to Rs. 90. Does not the granting of Rs. 42 more count very much for him? What do I ask after all? I ask that the disparity in scales of pay between a teacher in an aided-school and a Government school may be removed and the teacher in an aided-school paid the same as his counter-part in a Government school. (Sri A. Gajapathy Nayagar : On a point of information, Sir. Is there any difference in efficiency as between schools managed by these five different castes of teachers?) It is a difficult question to answer. But I say that the aided-schools do not in any way fall below the standard and that in fact they produce good results. I cannot say more than that. These teachers are the moulders of the Nation. They perform the noble task of shaping our future generation. In the interest of economic freedom and in the interest of maintaining our hard won freedom, is it not just that Government should remove these disparities in scales of pay of the teachers? It is more than eight years since we attained

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [8th August 1955]

Swaraj. But even to-day, under a Secular Government which stands for justice and equality of opportunity to all its citizens, we find this disparity in scales of pay between teachers who possess the same qualifications but who are employed in aided and Government schools. I thought that at least in the Second Five-Year Plan, Government would try to remove the disparity. But I am sorry to say, that while proposing to better the lot of the teachers by giving them more increased scales, yet they have made the distinction between teachers employed in Government and aided-schools, by saying that the teacher employed in an aided-school will be paid Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 less than what his counterpart in a Government school gets. When I was requesting for the removal of disparity, the pension scheme was announced, I find that there is a close link between the announcement of pension benefit to elementary school teachers and certain categories of secondary-grade teachers and my claim is to remove disparity. I find that some of the categories who had been affected by disparity are given pension. Pension is quite a different thing. It is something paid to a teacher after he retires, for the service he has put in. Life is quite uncertain. We can't say that we would live up to 60 years. Therefore to equate pension with scales of pay is not correct. Government cannot say that they had now announced pension benefit and as such there is no cause for removal of disparity in revision of pay scales. These are hard days of living. Cost of living has mounted up. In these days when the cost of living index is over 300, the salary of Rs. 30 paid to a teacher has not got the purchasing power of even Rs. 10 of prewar days. When such is the case, is the demand of the teacher, to avoid disharmony and discontent among the members of the profession, to place him on a par with the Government servants unjust? Can the Government deny that these people are not doing Government work? What work are they doing? Are they not engaged in the task of educating the future citizens of the country? Is it not the duty of the Government to help them? Who are their masters? Is not the Government their master? When Government admit that teachers are doing national work, is it not proper that they should be paid from the treasury? If Government actually feel that this question of agency stands in their way, they can take the solution. I gave a solution to this problem as early as 1946. These managements are agents and the principal which is the Government is responsible for the action of these agents. These people must be made to pay the Government scales. All the moneys given by the parents in the form of school fees and special fees must be remitted into the treasury. All these agents called the managements whether it be the District Board, Municipality or Panchayat, or private body should remit the school fees into the treasury. The managements, i.e., the agents, must be paid 15 per cent commission, the percentage to be based on the actual disbursement of salaries to teachers each month. The salary of the teachers should be drawn from the treasury on the authority of the headmaster. I have

8th August 1955] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

already referred to this proposal on the floor of this House and until the Government do this, they will have to dictate to these managements to pay their teachers according to the Government scales. Let the Government try this measure of ordering the managements to bring their scales of pay on a par with Government scales. I am sure no management would go to the extent of closing the school because they know how to safeguard their own interest better. They know what it is to run a school. They know whether it is a profiteering concern or a concern run at a loss. It is only a word from the Government that is necessary. It is only for a stroke of the pen from the Director of Public Instruction, Madras, that they are waiting. They can easily pay. Government are not scrutinizing their accounts. It takes only about Rs. 8 lakhs a year as recurring expenditure to avoid this disparity.

"I have just forgotten to refer to one matter. In one respect the aided high schools are favourably placed than the other schools. The headmasters of aided high schools in this State are placed on the scale of Rs. 250—15—400. They were placed on that scale some two years ago, if I remember correct. But the headmaster in a Government high school is not eligible for over Rs. 275. That is his maximum. The headmaster of an aided high school which has got 24 sections or nearly a strength of 1,000 students starts at Rs. 250 and goes up to Rs. 400. They are only a handful in this State. The headmaster in a local body school gets only Rs. 200. Salem is a big municipality and the Salem municipal high school has got a strength of over thousand pupils. I have already raised this question on the floor of this House. The municipality is willing to pay the headmaster at the scale of Rs. 250—15—400. But the Government stand in the way of saying that they cannot pay at that scale because other municipalities will find it difficult to pay at the same rate and that there should be some uniformity.

"Should there be not some uniformity in the scales of pay in regard to teachers? Why should there be this cinderella treatment? Of course, there are institutions where Government scales are given. But if you look into the accounts of these institutions, especially after 1947 when the grant formula in respect of high schools was revised, you will find that a lot of profit is made by these high schools. I do not mean the elementary schools. Elementary schools are run at a disadvantage after 1947. But high schools are run at great profit. It is not a great thing for the Government to remove the disparity in the scales of pay among teachers. It is only a question of Rs. 8 lakhs recurring expenditure. If the Government think that they cannot do it immediately, they can do it at least under the Second Five-Year Plan when they are prepared to spend crores of rupees on various projects. If Government think that they cannot do it immediately, they can certainly even to-morrow order these managements to pay according to these scales. They need not be afraid of these managements.

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [8th August 1955]

No institution will be closed because these institutions are running at a profit. If the District Board schools are not able to pay at this rate due to want of finance, it is the duty of the Government to run to their rescue, as after the attainment of independence the word 'local self-government' has no meaning except that it is a branch of the Government. Therefore, it is the duty of the Government to run to the rescue of the District Boards and Municipalities in this regard.

"In the case of schools run by panchayats, the teachers are not given increments at all and they are all placed like Markandeya always on a flat salary. It is better that these schools are taken over by the Government and that the accounts of these schools are scrutinised by the Deputy Inspector of Schools. The panchayat school teachers are paid their salaries at the whims and fancies of the Presidents of Panchayat Boards. There are cases in which they have not been paid even for five or six months. I have got instances reported to me.

"I request the Government to see that this disparity is removed. I want to make an earnest appeal to the hon. Members of the Legislature and the Government to see whether it is not high time that we removed this disparity and placed the teachers according to their qualifications on a particular scale of pay which would solve the problem of issuing so many Government orders.

"I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to speak."

* SRI E. H. PARAMESWARAN :—"Mr. Chairman, after the very eloquent manner in which my hon. friend Sri Krishnamoorthi has moved the resolution, I feel that I need not say much. I feel, Sir, that this is a very modest demand. I would not have been surprised if Sri Krishnamoorthi, the champion of the teachers, had made the demand much more ambitious. The resolution only recommends to the Government that the disparity in scales of pay as among teachers of the same qualifications be removed by up-grading. This resolution does not say anything about the salaries of teachers. The salaries of teachers have been very low. It is not merely the representatives of the teachers who are saying that the teachers' salaries have been inordinately low. Professor Humayun Kabir, Secretary to the Ministry of Education, Government of India and Sri Moulana Azad, Education Minister in their several pamphlets have stated that the salaries paid to the teachers now in the several States of the country are inordinately low. (Interruption.) We have been pleading again and again for a living wage for the teachers because we know that it is our own Government and that the Government's finances are not very satisfactory. This resolution does not say anything about the teachers' salaries but is very modest in pleading for the removal of disparity in scales of pay among teachers."

SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR :—"What is the income that the teacher actually gets a month?"

8th August 1955]

* SRI E. H. PARAMESWARAN :—" A lower grade trained teacher actually gets Rs. 20 per month."

SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR :—" What is the income that he actually gets over and above his pay? I ask whether he does not earn anything more than his pay."

* SRI E. H. PARAMESWARAN :—" In some cases he may earn by the sweat of his brow on by way of private tuition. You would not believe if I say that one rupee is paid to some of the teachers as tuition fees and due to poverty they are compelled to accept it.

" Everybody admits, Sir, that the salaries of teachers are very low and the Ministry of Education in their several pamphlets have admitted that fact. If this country is to advance and if education is to advance, the salaries of teachers ought to be revised. This resolution only asks for the removal of the invidious distinction that has been existing in the salaries of teachers working under different managements.

" Sri Krishnamoorthi has pointed out the several differences. I shall once again reiterate the differences. A graduate-trained teacher, a B.A.L.T. or B.A.B.T. who accepts appointment in an aided school start at Rs. 75 in the scale of Rs. 75—5—145. The Government scale which is adopted by certain District Boards and aided schools is Rs. 85—5—125—10—175. There is this difference. Three years ago the Government passed orders that a B.A.B.T. who is taken in Government service and who is working as an ordinary assistant in a Government school be started on a salary of Rs. 100, though he is denied increment for a period of two years. I ask why should there be this difference? So many people undergo training in the Saidapet Teachers' College or in some college. Suppose, out of three B.A.B.Ts. who have undergone training together, one goes to a private school, another to a District Board school and another to a Government school. It often happens that the person who has got the least merit among these and who goes to the Government school gets Rs. 100, while the teacher who goes to the aided school or the District Board school gets only Rs. 75. May I remind the hon. Members of what our great Right Hon. Sri Srinivasa Sastri said some 22 years ago with reference to this subject. He said half humourously 'I want to charge the Government with neglect of teachers and I will even go to the extent of saying that the Government are treating the teachers in Government service as their own children, teachers under Local Bodies as their step-children and teachers in aided schools as nobody's children'. He made these remarks at a Conference of teachers 22 years ago. While things have changed and while we are thankful to the Government for having made these changes, still there are disparities. I say that changes have taken place because in the matter of salaries of Headmasters, the Government

[Sri E. H. Parameswaran] [8th August 1955]

have followed a very unreasonable attitude. While the Headmaster of an aided school gets a salary of Rs. 250—15—400, the Headmaster of a Local Board school is allowed to reach a maximum of only Rs. 200. I spoke to the Hon. Minister for Education Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao, the previous Minister for Education. I gave him a written statement and told him 'There are Municipal High schools at Cannanore and Coimbatore with a strength of more than 1,000. Though the responsibilities of these Headmasters are very great, they are only allowed to draw a salary of Rs. 200 per month, while the Headmasters of aided schools are allowed to go up to Rs. 400.' That is why I say that things have changed and the remarks made by the Right Hon. Sri Srinivasa Sastri are not quite correct to-day. But still there is some force in them. I would therefore make an earnest appeal to the Hon. the Minister for Education. I know his great sympathy for the teachers. I know that under his guidance many things are being done for the teachers. The introduction of the system of pension for elementary school teachers is something generous and magnanimous. These distinctions in salaries between teachers under the different managements were made in 1947 when the Hon. Sri T. S. Avinasilingam Chettiar was the Minister for Education. We asked him what was the rhyme and reason for making these distinctions. While he was a great idealist and I admire his idealism and his desire to do something for the teachers, I am sorry to state that he bungled in the matter. He said 'Teachers in Government service are performing functions different from those obtaining in other schools and that is why I maintain this distinction'. I feel that the Ministry of Education wants to remove these disparities. These invidious distinctions in salary between teacher and teacher under the different managements should be done away with in the name of justice. I am sure that our Hon. Minister for Education will be good enough to remove these distinctions. The hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthy said that a sum of Rs. 8 lakhs would be required. I do not believe that a sum of Rs. 8 lakhs would be required to implement this resolution. Many of the private managements have got the funds to give the Government scales of pay. (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam: 'What about the elementary schools?') From next year onwards the Government are going to revise the salaries of the elementary school teachers. I hope that our Hon. Minister for Education will examine this question with sympathy and understanding. I was trying to read his views even when Sri G. Krishnamoorthy spoke. I was afraid whether he was going to say a 'categorical No' to this request. If not to-morrow, at least when the Second Five-Year Plan is implemented, there should be absolutely no distinction between teacher and teacher with regard to salary, and with regard to responsibilities and duties, we do not want the teacher in the aided school or in the District Board school to have less responsibilities than the teacher in a Government school.

8th August 1955] [Sri E. H. Parameswaran]

“ With these words, I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution of my hon. Friend.”

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to endorse the principle underlying this resolution. I feel that teachers with the same qualifications should be paid the same scales of salary in whatever agencies they may happen to serve. Different scales of pay would make the teachers a ‘nomadic tribe’. They like to go from one institution to another just to have a few rupees more. In this respect, I wish to reiterate what has been said about the Local Bodies that they find it a problem to secure trained teachers because the teachers go away to Government schools where they get better scales of pay and that is one of the causes for inefficiency in the schools run by the local bodies. I would therefore plead that this system of different scales of pay should go and that teachers with the same qualifications should be given the same scales of pay. I would earnestly appeal to the Hon. the Minister for Education to consider this in any scheme for the revision of the scales of pay of teachers under the consideration of the Government.”

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I strongly support the principle underlying this motion. The teachers are the lowest-paid employees. I have not the slightest doubt that the Hon. Minister for Education has the greatest sympathy for them. If he could raise their pay, he will certainly do it. This resolution is about removing the disparities between the teachers working in various schools. I would suggest that a minimum should be fixed for all the teachers. I think that there are some institutions which only pay the grant given by the Government. Therefore, we must insist on a minimum pay out of the Government grant to be paid to these teachers. After all, a teacher is paid Rs. 20 + Rs. 18 as dearness allowance. Can any family in the world live on Rs. 38 a month? It is a very poor pay. I invite the attention of the Hon. Minister for Education to the fact that some of the institutions pay only the grant given by the Government. I am not sure that even this grant is fully paid. I do not want to close those schools, but certainly a way must be found to pay something more to the teachers. For my part, I would be willing to support any measure brought by the Government to tax people who get Rs. 500 and more for the purpose of paying these teachers. (Hear, hear.) I hope that they will not grudge. People who get a good income must pay something for the education of our children. I wish the Finance Minister brings in a Bill to tax people who get more than Rs. 500 a month either in the form of income-tax or some other tax for paying the teachers. Actually the Hon. the Education Minister is faced only with the question of finance. As he also happens to be the Finance Minister, there may not be too much fight in the Cabinet. The well-to-do persons can certainly pay a small percentage of their income, say 2 per cent or 3 per cent or 5 per cent for the education of our children, because in a few years’ time, we have

[Dr. V. K. John]

[8th August 1955]

to bring in free and compulsory education for all the children under fourteen years of age. It is necessary that a minimum pay is fixed for all the teachers and I would suggest to the Hon. the Finance Minister to tax well-to-do people to find funds for education. A sum of Rs. 38 is miserably a very low salary and the teachers have to train our youngsters who are going to be the future citizens of our country. I think more attention should be paid to the problem of the teachers by this Government and also by the Members of the Legislature. How are we to pay these teachers better and how can we extend education to all? It does not matter if the richer section of the public bear this extra burden for this laudable object of paying teachers something more and extending education, which the finances of our Government are unable to meet. I am quite sure that the Education Minister will deeply sympathise with the principle underlying this resolution and find some way out to see that teachers are given a minimum living wage, and there is not much disparity or any disparity between the scales of pay of teachers employed by managements, district boards and Government. I hope, Sir, this House will view this resolution with great sympathy and pass it."

SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAJ :—" Sir, the hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthi has made out a very good case."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Sir, we shall rise at 5 p.m. to-day and continue discussion on some other day. There are several hon. Members wishing to speak."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" We will have it on the next non-official day."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Two Bills have been put on the agenda for to-morrow. They were passed in the Assembly to-day. We need not rush through those Bills to-morrow."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" These Bills were published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* a very long time before."

* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" We are entitled to three days' notice. We may take up the Appropriation Bill to-morrow, and if insisted upon, we may take up the Police (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1955. The other one is a big Bill, and we should like to study it. I object to this rushing through of these Bills. The Bills were passed in the Assembly only to-day. We can pass the Bills here in the course of this month. Why should we rush through? We are establishing a precedent and we go on from precedent to precedent. I would say that the City Police and Gaming (Amendment) Bill may be taken up on another day."

* SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAJ :—" Sir, the hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthi has made out a very good case on behalf of the teachers. As a matter of fact, I did not know the difficulties of teachers until Sri Krishnamoorthi spoke about them. I make a confession that I did not know that the lot of the teachers was so very miserable. On the other hand, on previous occasions, I had

8th August 1955] [Sri A. M. Allapichai]

been feeling that Sri Krishnamoorthi was spoiling the case of teachers and their miserable lot by speaking about them too much. Whenever he got up and spoke about teachers, I thought he was making the case of teachers very bad. To-day I see that not only on this occasion but on all other occasions he has a right to speak for the teachers. He has revealed to us the pitiable condition of the teacher having to maintain himself, his wife and child, on a meagre salary of Rs. 30 or Rs. 35. There is no scope for corruption on the part of a teacher. In the case of clerks and others in departments, there is some scope for corruption. I am not concealing the fact that sometimes it so happens a clerk gets some mamool which supplements his income. There is no such thing in the case of the teacher. Sri G. Krishnamoorthi has excited our sympathy. Dr. V. K. John said that rich people could be taxed to pay the teachers. Education tax could be levied on rich people. No doubt we are giving free education up to III Form. That is not enough. We should make it free up to V Form. We should take a lesson in this regard from Ceylon Government and from the Government of Kashmir. The Government of Kashmir have made University education free. So also is the position in Ceylon. Our State which is leading all other States in all matters must give a lead in this matter also. The Finance Minister will do well to consider the suggestion of Dr. V. K. John that certain people getting an income of over a certain amount ought to be taxed and that tax ought to be earmarked for the purpose of paying these teachers. Whoever may be the Finance Minister and however generous he may be, he is only representing the Government, and Government are generally like a machine. They have to move like a machine. They have got certain difficulties to overcome. We cannot expect much from Government. The Government will have to consider the question of paying teachers very sympathetically. Even peons in Government offices get more pay than teachers. The teacher is to shape the destiny of the future generation entrusted to his care. The teachers cannot get on with Rs. 35 or so. The teachers cannot pay adequate attention to the pupils under their care with their poor emoluments."

DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Sir, why did not the Deputy Chairman know the plight of these teachers up to this time? "

* SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAH :—" The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may find fault with me for not having known the plight of these teachers so far. I confess my mistake. I confess my ignorance. I am not ashamed to confess. Had I known, I would have goaded Sri Krishnamoorthi to speak about teachers here everyday not for five minutes, but for one hundred minutes.

" Thank you Sir."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I now adjourn the House till 3 p.m. to-morrow."

The House then adjourned.

